arXiv:1603.01349v1 [math.NT] 4 Mar 2016

TWO ARITHMETIC RELATIONS OF A SUBSPACE OF $P^n(K)$ AND A SUBGROUP OF $\mathrm{Aut}(K)$

JUN-ICHI MATSUSHITA

Abstract. Let K be a commutative field and let V be a subspace of $P^n(K)$. Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(K)$ and define the action of Γ on $P^n(K)$ by letting $\sigma((x_i)_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n})$ be $(\sigma(x_i))_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ for $\sigma\in\Gamma$, $(x_i)_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n}\in P^n(K)$. In this paper, using two arithmetic notions defined in terms of the Plücker coordinates of V and the invariant field of Γ, we answer the questions: By what number is the dimension of the join (resp. meet) of $\sigma(V)$ ($\sigma\in\Gamma$) greater (resp. less) than the dimension of V?

1. Introduction

Let K be a commutative field and let V be a subspace of $P^n(K)$, the projective n-space over K. Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(K)$, the automorphism group of K, and define the action of Γ on $P^n(K)$ by

$$\sigma((x_i)_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n})=(\sigma(x_i))_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n} \tag{1}$$

for $\sigma\in\Gamma$, $(x_i)_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n}\in P^n(K)$. Then, since $\sigma(V)$ ($\sigma\in\Gamma$) are subspaces of $P^n(K)$ such that $\dim_K\sigma(V)$ ($\sigma\in\Gamma$) are equal to $\dim_K V$, it is possible and natural to ask the questions:

(i) By what number is $\dim_K\bigvee_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)$ greater than $\dim_K V$?,

(ii) By what number is $\dim_K\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)$ less than $\dim_K V$?,

where $\bigvee$ and $\bigcap$ denote, respectively, the join and the meet of subspaces of $P^n(K)$. In this paper, we answer these questions in terms of the Plücker coordinates of V and the invariant field of Γ. Let k be the invariant field of Γ. For each m-dimensional subspace X of $P^n(K)$, let $(\ldots,X_{i_0\cdots i_m},\ldots)$ denote the Plücker coordinates of X and define the *k-irrationality degree* Irr_k and the *k-irrationality codegree* Irr_k^* of X by taking a permutation $j_0\cdots j_n$ of $0\cdots n$ such that $X_{j_0\cdots j_m}\neq 0$ and letting

$$\mathrm{Irr}_k X=\dim_k[X]_{j_0\cdots j_n}-\dim_k\left([X]_{j_0\cdots j_n}\cap k^{m+1}\right), \tag{2}$$

$$\mathrm{Irr}_k^* X=\dim_k[X]^*_{j_0\cdots j_n}-\dim_k\left([X]^*_{j_0\cdots j_n}\cap k^{n-m}\right), \tag{3}$$

where $[X]_{j_0\cdots j_n}$ and $[X]^*_{j_0\cdots j_n}$ denote, respectively, the linear span over k of

$$\left\{\left(\frac{X_{j_0\cdots j_{s-1}j_tj_{s+1}\cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0\cdots j_m}}\right)_{0\leqslant s\leqslant m}:m+1\leqslant t\leqslant n\right\} \tag{4}$$

in K^{m+1} and the linear span over k of

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{X_{j_0 \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0 \cdots j_m}} \right)_{m+1 \leqslant s \leqslant n} : 0 \leqslant t \leqslant m \right\}$$

in K^{n-m}. Then we can prove that Irr_k and Irr_k^* are well-defined (that is, for every subspace X of $P^n(K)$, $\operatorname{Irr}_k X$ and $\operatorname{Irr}_k^* X$ are independent of the choice of $j_0 \cdots j_n$) and $\operatorname{Irr}_k V$ and $\operatorname{Irr}_k^* V$ are answers to the questions (i) and (ii), respectively, that is, the following holds.

Theorem. *We have*

$$\dim_K \bigvee_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V) = \dim_K V + \operatorname{Irr}_k V, \tag{5}$$

$$\dim_K \bigcap_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V) = \dim_K V - \operatorname{Irr}_k^* V. \tag{6}$$

In the following sections, we actually prove that Irr_k is well-defined and (5) holds and that Irr_k^* is well-defined and (6) holds.

2. Duality of (5) and (6)

For each subspace X of $P^n(K)$, let X^* denote the dual of X, that is, the set of $(x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K)$ satisfying

$$\forall (a_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in X \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x_i = 0.$$

Then, since the join of subspaces of $P^n(K)$ is the dual of the meet of their duals, we have

$$\bigvee_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V) = \left(\bigcap_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V)^* \right)^*,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\bigvee_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V) = \left(\bigcap_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V^*) \right)^* \tag{7}$$

because every $\sigma \in \Gamma$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(V)^* &= \left\{ (x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K) : \forall (a_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in \sigma(V) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x_i = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ (x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K) : \forall (a_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in V \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} \sigma(a_i) x_i = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ (x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K) : \forall (a_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in V \quad \sigma\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i \sigma^{-1}(x_i) \right) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ (x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K) : \forall (a_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in V \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i \sigma^{-1}(x_i) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sigma(V^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Also we have

Proposition 1. *For each m-dimensional subspace X of $P^n(K)$, for each permutation $j_0 \cdots j_n$ of $0 \cdots n$ such that $X_{j_0 \cdots j_m} \neq 0$, the right-hand side of (2) is equal to the expression obtained by replacing X, $j_0 \cdots j_m$, $j_{m+1} \cdots j_n$, and $n-m$ in the right-hand side of (3) by X^*, $j_{m+1} \cdots j_n$, $j_0 \cdots j_m$, and $n-(n-m-1) = m+1$, respectively, that is,*

$$\dim_k [X^*]^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n j_0 \cdots j_m} - \dim_k \left([X^*]^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n j_0 \cdots j_m} \cap k^{m+1} \right), \tag{8}$$

where $[X^*]^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n j_0 \cdots j_m}$ denotes the linear span over k of

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n}}{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n}} \right)_{0 \leqslant s \leqslant m} : m+1 \leqslant t \leqslant n \right\} \tag{9}$$

in K^{m+1}.

Proof. By the well-known relation between the Plücker coordinates and the dual Plücker coordinates of a subspace of $P^n(K)$ [3, Chapter VII, § 3, Theorem I], letting ϵ and δ be, respectively, the Levi-Civita symbol and the generalized Kronecker delta, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X_{j_0 \cdots j_{s-1} j_t j_{s+1} \cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0 \cdots j_m}} &= \frac{\epsilon_{j_0 \cdots j_{s-1} j_t j_{s+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n} X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n}}{\epsilon_{j_0 \cdots j_n} X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n}} \\ &= \delta^{j_0 \cdots j_n}_{j_0 \cdots j_{s-1} j_t j_{s+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n} \frac{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n}}{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n}} \\ &= -\frac{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n}}{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n}} \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 \leqslant s \leqslant m$ and every $m+1 \leqslant t \leqslant n$. Therefore (4) is equal to

$$\left\{ -\left(\frac{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_n}}{X^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n}} \right)_{0 \leqslant s \leqslant m} : m+1 \leqslant t \leqslant n \right\},$$

that is, the set of additive inverses of elements of (9). Since a subset of K^{m+1} and the set of additive inverses of elements of it linearly span over k the same space, this implies

$$[X]_{j_0 \cdots j_n} = [X^*]^*_{j_{m+1} \cdots j_n j_0 \cdots j_m},$$

which implies that the right-hand side of (2) is equal to (8). □

Proposition 1 is easily seen to imply that if either Irr_k or Irr^*_k is well-defined, then both Irr_k and Irr^*_k are well-defined and satisfy

$$\mathrm{Irr}_k V = \mathrm{Irr}^*_k V^*; \tag{10}$$

(7) and (10) imply that (5) is equivalent to

$$\dim_K \left(\bigcap_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V^*) \right)^* = \dim_K V + \mathrm{Irr}^*_k V^*,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\dim_K \bigcap_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(V^*) = \dim_K V^* - \mathrm{Irr}^*_k V^*,$$

that is, the equality obtained by replacing V in (6) by V^*. Therefore, for proving that Irr_k is well-defined and (5) holds and that Irr_k^* is well-defined and (6) holds, it suffices to prove either of these, say, the latter, which we prove in the following section.

3. Proof of (6)

In the present section, $P^n(k)$ denotes the image of $k^{n+1}-\{0\}$ by the canonical surjection $K^{n+1}-\{0\}\to P^n(K)$, and a subspace of $P^n(K)$ (resp. K^{n+1}) is said to be *k-rational* iff it is (or, equivalently, its dual is) spanned by a subset of $P^n(k)$ (resp. k^{n+1}). Define the action of Γ on K^{n+1} by (1) for $\sigma\in\Gamma$, $(x_i)_{0\leqslant i\leqslant n}\in K^{n+1}$. Then, as can be seen, for example, from [1, Chapter II, § 8, no. 7, Theorem 1 (i)] (or, more directly, from [2, Chapter V, § 10, no. 4, Proposition 6 *a*)]) applied to the vector K-space K^{n+1} with the k-structure k^{n+1}, we have that

a subspace of K^{n+1} is k-rational iff it is stable under the action of Γ on K^{n+1},

which is easily seen to imply that

a subspace of $P^n(K)$ is k-rational iff it is stable under the action of Γ on $P^n(K)$,

which implies that

$$\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\text{ is }k\text{-rational}\tag{11}$$

because every $\tau\in\Gamma$ satisfies $\tau\Gamma=\Gamma$ and hence

$$\tau\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\tau\left(\sigma(V)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\tau\sigma(V)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\tau\Gamma}\sigma(V)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V).$$

For each subspace X of $P^n(K)$, let $\widetilde{X}$ denote the span of $X\cap P^n(k)$ in $P^n(K)$, which is the largest k-rational subspace of $P^n(K)$ contained in X. Then, since a k-rational subspace of $P^n(K)$ is itself the largest k-rational subspace of $P^n(K)$ contained in it, (11) implies

$$\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)=\widetilde{\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)=\widetilde{V}\tag{12}$$

because we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\right)\cap P^n(k)&=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\left(\sigma(V)\cap P^n(k)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\left(\sigma(V)\cap\sigma\left(P^n(k)\right)\right)\\&=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma\left(V\cap P^n(k)\right)=V\cap P^n(k)\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\widetilde{\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)}=\widetilde{V}.$$

Also we have

Proposition 2. *For each m-dimensional subspace X of $P^n(K)$, for each permutation $j_0 \cdots j_n$ of $0 \cdots n$ such that $X_{j_0 \cdots j_m} \neq 0$, the right-hand side of (3) is equal to $m - \dim_K \widetilde{X}$.*

Proof. Let X' (resp. $\widetilde{X}'$) denote the subspace of K^{n+1} such that X (resp. $\widetilde{X}$) is the image of $X' - \{0\}$ (resp. $\widetilde{X}' - \{0\}$) by the canonical surjection $K^{n+1} - \{0\} \to P^n(K)$. Then $\widetilde{X}'$ is the span of $X' \cap k^{n+1}$ in K^{n+1}, and hence satisfies

$$\dim_k \left(X' \cap k^{n+1}\right) = \dim_K \widetilde{X}' = \dim_K \widetilde{X} + 1. \tag{13}$$

Let $\mu : k^{n+1} \to K^{n-m}$ be the k-linear map sending $(x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n}$ to

$$\left(x_{j_s} - \sum_{t=0}^{m} x_{j_t} \frac{X_{j_0 \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0 \cdots j_m}} \right)_{m+1 \leqslant s \leqslant n},$$

that is,

$$(x_{j_s})_{m+1 \leqslant s \leqslant n} - \sum_{t=0}^{m} x_{j_t} \left(\frac{X_{j_0 \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0 \cdots j_m}} \right)_{m+1 \leqslant s \leqslant n}.$$

Then we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \mu = k^{n-m} + [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_k \operatorname{Ker} \mu &= n + 1 - \dim_k \operatorname{Im} \mu \\ &= n + 1 - \dim_k \left(k^{n-m} + [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} \right) \\ &= n + 1 - \left\{ n - m + \dim_k [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} - \dim_k \left(k^{n-m} \cap [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} \right) \right\} \\ &= m + 1 - \left\{ \dim_k [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} - \dim_k \left([X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} \cap k^{n-m} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

(13) and (14) imply that

$$\dim_k \left(X' \cap k^{n+1}\right) = \dim_k \operatorname{Ker} \mu \tag{15}$$

is equivalent to

$$\dim_K \widetilde{X} = m - \left\{ \dim_k [X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} - \dim_k \left([X]^*_{j_0 \cdots j_n} \cap k^{n-m} \right) \right\}. \tag{16}$$

Since it is easily shown (for example, as in [3, Chapter VII, § 2, pp. 289–290]) that

$$\forall m + 1 \leqslant s \leqslant n \quad x_{j_s} - \sum_{t=0}^{m} x_{j_t} \frac{X_{j_0 \cdots j_{t-1} j_s j_{t+1} \cdots j_m}}{X_{j_0 \cdots j_m}} = 0$$

is a necessary and sufficient condition for $(x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in P^n(K)$ to be in X, and hence for $(x_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in K^{n+1}$ to be in X', we have

$$\operatorname{Ker} \mu = X' \cap k^{n+1}$$

and hence (15). Therefore we have (16), that is, the right-hand side of (3) is equal to $m - \dim_K \widetilde{X}$. □

Proposition 2 implies that Irr^*_k is well-defined and satisfies

$$\dim_K \widetilde{V} = \dim_K V - \mathrm{Irr}^*_k V; \tag{17}$$

(12) and (17) imply (6). Therefore we have that Irr^*_k is well-defined and (6) holds.

Remark 1. Let $\overline{V}$ denote the meet of all k-rational hyperplanes containing V, whose dual is the join of all k-rational points contained in V^*, that is, $\widetilde{V^*}$. Then we have, dually to (12) (resp. (17)),

$$(a)\ \bigvee_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)=\overline{V}\ (\text{resp. }(b)\ \dim_K\overline{V}=\dim_K V+\operatorname{Irr}_k V)$$

because (7) (resp. (10)) implies that (a) (resp. (b)) is equivalent to

$$\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V^*)\right)^*=\overline{V}\ (\text{resp. }\dim_K\overline{V}=\dim_K V+\operatorname{Irr}_k^* V^*),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V^*)=\widetilde{V^*}\ (\text{resp. }\dim_K\widetilde{V^*}=\dim_K V^*-\operatorname{Irr}_k^* V^*),$$

that is, the equality obtained by replacing V in (12) (resp. (17)) by V^*. (a) and (b) imply (5), just as (12) and (17) imply (6).

Remark 2. In fact, the argument in the because-clause in the third sentence of this section, which depends on the assumption that Γ *is a subgroup of* $\operatorname{Aut}(K)$, can be replaced by "every $\tau\in\Gamma$ satisfies $\tau\Gamma\subset\Gamma$ and hence

$$\tau\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\tau\left(\sigma(V)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\tau\sigma(V)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\tau\Gamma}\sigma(V)\supset\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V),$$

and satisfies

$$\dim_K\tau\left(X\right)=\dim_K X$$

for every subspace X of $P^n(K)$ and hence, in particular, for

$$X=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V),$$

and therefore satisfies

$$\tau\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\right)=\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}\sigma(V)\text{"},$$

which and all other arguments in Section 2 and this section are valid even under the weaker assumption that Γ *is a subsemigroup of* $\operatorname{Aut}(K)$. Therefore we have that Irr_k is well-defined and (5) holds and that Irr_k^* is well-defined and (6) holds under this weaker assumption, which coincides with the original assumption when Γ is finite.

References

[1] N. Bourbaki, Elements of Mathematics, Algebra I, Chapters 1–3, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1998 (Reprint of the 1989 English translation).
[2] N. Bourbaki, Elements of Mathematics, Algebra II, Chapters 4–7, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2003 (Reprint of the 1990 English edition).
[3] W. V. D. Hodge and D. Pedoe, Methods of Algebraic Geometry, vol. 1, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994

6-5-15, Higashiogu, Arakawa-ku, Tokyo 116-0012, Japan
E-mail address: j-matsu@pk.highway.ne.jp